

products, and Group II, including Claims 29 – 33 directed to improved plant seeds. The Examiner asserts that these inventions are related as subcombinations, distinct from one another which have acquired separate status in the art as evidenced by their different classification.

The claims of Group I are directed to diacyl ureas prepared by reacting a carboxylic acid with urea or a substituted urea. The claims of Group II are directed to improved plant seeds produced by treating seeds with diformylurea and the reaction products of Group I. Thus, both of the inventions delineated by the Examiner are related and, in the view of Applicant, should remain in the same application.

Applicant traverses the Examiners election requirement. Applicant believes that these inventions, both relating to reaction products formed by reacting carboxylic acid with urea or a substituted urea to produce diacyl ureas, including diformylurea, and to seeds treated with those products are so closely related that they should remain in the same application. It is common practice to include in the same application claims to related products. Because the claims herein are so related, Applicant believes that they should remain in the same application. Accordingly, the restriction requirement has been traversed.

Conclusion

Having fully responded to the restriction and election requirement in the pending Office Action, Applicant requests that the restriction requirement be withdrawn and that prosecution of all the pending claims be commenced. Applicant requests that all of the claims in the captioned application, i.e., Claims 7 – 10 and Claims 29 – 33, be promptly examined on the merits. If, however, the restriction requirement is maintained,

Applicant requests that at least the claims of Group II, i.e., Claims 29 – 33, be promptly examined on the merits. Clearly, claims directed to improved plant seeds produced by treating seeds with the reaction products of the present invention, i.e., diacyl ureas, including diformylurea, are neither disclosed nor suggested by the prior art. Accordingly, Applicant requests that these claims be promptly allowed.

No additional examination fee is required with this Response. However, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any fee which may be required with this Response to Deposit Account No. 19-2112. This authorization is made in duplicate in the accompanying letter.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite allowance, he is urged to contact the undersigned at (713) 227-8008.

Respectfully submitted,



Walter R. Brookhart
Reg. No. 29,518

Date: 20 October 2004
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON, L.L.P.
600 Travis Street, Suite 1600
Houston, Texas 77002-2911
Tel.: (713) 227-8008
Fax: (713) 227-9508